REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 4-7 are presented for further consideration. Claim 7 is independent.

Unless indicated to the contrary, claims are amended for non-statutory reason, such as to place the claims in a more common format for U.S. practice and to reduce or eliminate European phraseology.

Objections to the Drawings

Applicants have considered the objection to the drawings for allegedly not showing the at least one drivable toothed blade as recited in claim 4. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The filed application discloses:

The hair-trimmer 1 has a cutting unit 46. The cutting unit 46 is fitted with a toothed cutting mechanism 47 that in the present case is intended to serve as a personal care tool and that has a stationary toothed blade and a toothed blade that can be driven by means of the motor 30, and by means of the toothed cutting mechanism 47 hair to be cut can be trimmed, i.e. shortened.

Clearly, the toothed cutting mechanism 47 would suffice as a clear depiction of the drivable toothed blade as claimed.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all features of the pending claims are shown within the requirements of Rule 83(a). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Objections to the Specification

Applicants have revised the Abstract in order to address the potential confusion with regard to the term 'means.' Applicants note that the Abstract as filed commences on page 11 and stands alone on this page. Moreover, the Abstract was filed as a national stage filing based on a PCT application. As such,

the Abstract is to be entered.

The informalities noticed at page 7 of the filed application have been addressed.

Applicants thank the Examiner for providing information about recommended section headings. However, Applicants respectfully decline to add the headings. Section headings are not statutorily required for filing a non-provisional patent application under 35 USC § 111(a), but per 37 CFR § 1.51(d) are only guidelines that are suggested for applicant's use. (See "Miscellaneous Changes in Patent Practice, Response to comments 17 and 18" (Official Gazette, August 13, 1996) [Docket No: 950620162-6014-02] RIN 0651-AA75 ("Section 1.77 is permissive rather than mandatory. ... [T]he Office will not require any application to comply with the format set forth in 1.77")). (See also MPEP § 608.01(a)).

Claim Objections

The objections to the claims has been considered. However, these are moot in view of the present response.

Allowable Claims

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication of allowability of claims 3,5 and 6. The subject matter of claims 1, 2 and 3 have been included in new claim 7, which is now allowable. Claims 4-6 depend from claim 7 directly or indirectly. Therefore all claims are allowable.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102, 103

The propriety of the rejections under these sections of the Code are not conceded. However, the present response renders all claims allowable and the rejections of claims 1, 2 and 4 moot.

Conclusion

In view the foregoing, applicant(s) respectfully request(s) that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and further replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account Number 50-0238 for any additional fees, including, but not limited to, the fees under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. §1.17.

If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of:

Phillips Electronics North America Corp.

by: William S. Francos (Reg. No. 38,456)

Date: June 12, 2007

Volentine & Whitt, PLLC
Two Meridian Blvd.
Wyomissing, PA 19610
(610) 375-3513 (v)
(610) 375-3277 (f)